

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In further response to the Office Action mailed June 30, 2006, and the Advisory Action mailed October 4, 2006, Applicants amend their application and request reconsideration. In this Amendment, claims 8-10 are added so that claims 5-10 are now pending.

In this Amendment, a single change is made in claim 5. The location of the securing member, which relates to its function, is described more specifically in amended claim 5. With reference to the embodiment of the invention shown in Figures 2 and 3 of the patent application, the securing member 7 is mounted on the fixing members 6 between the base members 5 and the mount member 8, closer to the mount member 8 than to the base members 5. In other words, the amended claim is clearly supported by the application as filed.

Claims 5-7 were rejected as unpatentable over Wittur (WO 99/16694) in view of Iyoda (JP 2000-086126).¹ This rejection is respectfully traversed, particularly as to the claims now presented.

Applicants maintain the arguments against the rejection appearing at page 4 of the Amendment filed March 17, 2006. These arguments are not repeated and are incorporated by reference. Applicants note, but disagree with, the reply supplied in the Office Action mailed June 30, 2006 at pages 4 and 5.

In making the rejection, the Examiner again acknowledged that there is no element in Wittur corresponding to the securing member of claim 5. For that element, reliance was placed upon Iyoda and the clamp 11 that is fastened to the mount member above the hoisting machine in the hoistway. The mount member is, in turn, mounted to the wall of the hoistway above the hoisting machine 6.

In the invention as defined by claim 5, the securing member, which is secured to the wall of the hoistway, is on the fixing member and between the base member

¹ The first named inventor's family name is Iyoda, the name used here, whereas the Examiner insists on using the given name, Hiromi, although misspelled in the Office Action.


that contacts the bottom of the hoistway and the mounting member that supports the hoisting machine. Thus, in the invention as defined by claim 5, the securing member provides desired additional strength to the fixing member, counteracting the bending moment otherwise applied by the hoisting machine to the fixing member because the hoisting machine is not directly above the fixing member. However, since the securing member is not in direct contact with the hoisting machine, as is the clamp 11 in Iyoda, vibrations from the hoisting machine are reduced, before being transmitted through the securing member to the wall of the hoistway. In addition, in the invention as defined by claim 5, the securing member is below the hoisting machine, whereas the clamp 11 is above Iyoda's hoisting machine.

Because of the foregoing differences between the asserted combination of Wittur and Iyoda and claim 5, claims 5-7 as presented here are clearly patentable.

New claims 8-10 are clearly supported by the application as filed. While there is a similarity between those claims and pending claims 5-7, claim 8 is of different scope than claim 5. Claim 8 is intended to be simpler and more clearly directed to the features of the invention disclosed that are clearly distinct from Wittur. New claim 9 is similar in its limitation to claim 6 but is intended to describe in a different way, and perhaps with greater clarity, the mount member that is disclosed in the patent application. Likewise, new claim 10 has some correspondence to original claim 7, but is simpler in form. These claims clearly distinguish from Wittur.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 5-7 and allowance of claims 5-10 are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,


Jeffrey A. Wyand, Reg. No. 29,458
LEVDIG, VOIT & MAYER
700 Thirteenth Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, DC 20005-3960
(202) 737-6770 (telephone)
(202) 737-6776 (facsimile)

Date: October 25, 2006
JAW:ves